	S DISTRICT COURT OF MINNESOTA
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA) CRIMINAL ACTION) NO. 07-259 (ADM/RLE))
VS.)
(01) LARRY CURTIS TATE	Courtroom 13 WestFriday, April 25, 2008Minneapolis, Minnesota

SENTENCING DAY 2

BEFORE THE HONORABLE ANN D. MONTGOMERY UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: OFFICE OF THE U.S. ATTORNEY

By: TRACY L. PERZEL

Assistant U.S. Attorney 600 United States Courthouse

300 South Fourth Street

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415

For the Defendant: LAW OFFICES OF TIMOTHY R. ANDERSON

By: TIMOTHY R. ANDERSON, ESQUIRE 310 Fourth Avenue South - Suite 1050

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415

Court Reporter: TIMOTHY J. WILLETTE, RDR, CRR, CBC, CCP

Official Court Reporter - U.S.D.C.

1005 United States Courthouse

300 South Fourth Street

Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415

612.664.5108

1	(4:15 p.m.)
2	PROCEEDINGS
3	IN OPEN COURT
4	(Defendant present)
5	THE COURT: Good afternoon. Please be seated.
6	THE CLERK: The Court calls the case of United
7	States of America vs. Larry Curtis Tate, Criminal Case No.
8	07-259.
9	Would counsel note their appearances, please.
10	MS. PERZEL: Good afternoon, your Honor. Tracy
11	Perzel on behalf of the United States.
12	THE COURT: Good afternoon, Ms. Perzel.
13	Mr. Anderson?
14	MR. ANDERSON: Good afternoon, your Honor.
15	Tim Anderson here on behalf of Mr. Larry Tate, also present
16	before the Court.
17	THE COURT: And good afternoon, Mr. Tate.
18	I apologize that we're running a little behind the
19	announced schedule. I've been in trial and needed a few
20	minutes to talk to Ms. Chaiken.
21	I have read the position papers that you have filed
22	on Mr. Tate's behalf, Mr. Anderson
23	MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.
24	THE COURT: as well as Ms. Perzel's response,
25	and let me tell you about a couple changes that are going to

2.1

be made in the presentence investigation to conform with some of the points raised and some other -- at least in my opinion -- relatively minor issues.

First of all, the cover sheet of the presentence investigation will obviously be changed to reflect Mr. Anderson as your new attorney, Mr. Tate.

Paragraph 52, which relates to the calculation of the base level offense, will be changed from 32 to 30 because of the new guidelines and the new configuration, and therefore that level will be put at 30 rather than 32, but it really is not going to affect the ultimate sentence here because the career offender status applies. I'll hear your argument on that, but at least in terms of my preliminary adjustments, that one will stay as is.

Also, on page 14 or paragraph 65 of the presentence investigation, after some further checking about the sentence actually served for the fourth degree assault, it's more appropriately assessed as a two-point rather than a three-point offense, which will bring the criminal history points down slightly to 26 total points, still a very high number and still falling within the category VI, which doesn't change the guideline numbers but does make some changes in the presentence investigation. So those are changes that will be made for sure.

Based upon the probation officer Ms. Alston's

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

2.3

24

25

```
application of the guidelines to the facts in this case, it's
my intent to adopt a guideline determination of this being a
base level offense of 32. It's a total offense level of 34
and three points deducted for acceptance of responsibility,
but the career offender applies, leaving it at 34.
          This is a criminal history now with 26 points,
still a Category VI, career offender, which would make the
quidelines sentence 262 to 327 months, the supervised release
period five years, the fine range $17,500 to $4 million, plus
costs of imprisonment or supervised release, and the
applicability of a $100 special assessment.
          Does the Government take issue with the Court's
factual statements in the presentence investigation as my
findings of fact or the guideline analysis?
         MS. PERZEL:
                        No, your Honor.
          THE COURT:
                     Mr. Anderson, I know you do based on
some of your pleadings or position papers and I'll hear you
from the lectern.
          First of all, I don't know that at this point you
dispute the factual statements. Do you?
          MR. ANDERSON:
                          No, your Honor.
          THE COURT:
                     I will adopt those as my findings of
fact and hear you with regard to your guideline analysis.
         MR. ANDERSON:
                          Just briefly. I think I -- I hope
I laid it out clearly, the argument, in the sentencing
```

1 pleading regarding whether or not Mr. Tate should be treated 2 as a career offender. The argument is essentially this: 3 That he did plead to a charge. The fourth degree 4 assault was a felony as written in the statute. The argument 5 is that it was not clear that he was actually sentenced as a 6 felony under Minnesota law and the argument is that by 7 operation of the law, that my argument is that he was 8 actually sentenced as a gross misdemeanor. Therefore, under 9 the stay of imposition of sentence under Minnesota Statute 10 609.135 it was actually started as a gross and it ended as a 11 misdemeanor ultimately and therefore it shouldn't count as a 12 prior crime of violence under the career offender quidelines. 13 Other than that, I would leave it submitted on the 14 briefs regarding that issue. 15 THE COURT: All right. Ms. Perzel, did you want 16 to be heard briefly on that issue? 17 MS. PERZEL: Your Honor, I have nothing beyond 18 what's stated in my position pleading. 19 All right. Well, after examination of THE COURT: 20 those pleadings and those arguments, I am convinced that the 2.1 career offender appropriately applies. The issue is the way 22 the sentence was imposed originally and I didn't find --23 although I respect your argument, I didn't find any authority 24 for changing the career offender level, so the guideline 25 parameters as I've announced them will apply to this case.

```
1
     But of course, that does not end the sentencing analysis
 2
     because of the 3553 factors and case law allowing the Court
 3
     to consider other factors with regard to the guideline
 4
     analysis.
 5
                So, at this point, if you and Mr. Tate will come
6
     forward to the lectern.
 7
           (Mr. Anderson and the defendant approach the lectern)
                            Ms. Perzel, did the Government wish to
 8
                THE COURT:
9
     use its right to allocute regarding Mr. Tate's sentence?
10
                MS. PERZEL:
                              Your Honor, I may just briefly
11
     perhaps following whatever Mr. Anderson --
12
                             Okay. Mr. Anderson, then, we'll hear
                THE COURT:
13
     from you and your client in whatever order you might prefer.
14
                MR. ANDERSON:
                                Thank you, your Honor. I think I
15
     will start, give an argument, and then I think Mr. Tate does
16
     wish to be heard.
17
                First of all, based on the fact that you have found
18
     that he does qualify as a career offender, as you stated,
19
     there still is an analysis left to be made under the 3553(a)
20
     factors. And as submitted at length in the sentencing
2.1
     pleading, under those factors, there is sufficient and
     substantial -- there are substantial reasons for this Court
22
23
     to depart substantially downward in that very significant and
24
     high guideline range of 262 to 327 months under the career
25
     offender guideline.
```

2.1

Number one, under the nature and circumstances of the offense, this was a relatively typical low-level drug dealing offense. There was a total of a little over four ounces of crack cocaine. I'm not downplaying the seriousness of the offense and neither is Mr. Tate, but I would at least submit that it's no more serious than the typical such conspiracy case.

And I think especially focusing on the **Kimbrough** case and the huge disparity in the career offender guidelines range between crack and powder cocaine, I think that that alone, but supplemented by all sorts of other reasons, that alone is sufficient reason for this Court to depart substantially downward. And as noted in my brief, the career offender guideline range for crack cocaine under these circumstances is 262 to 327 months, but for the same amount of roughly four ounces, a little over four ounces of powder cocaine would be 151 to 188 months, well over — approximately ten years lower.

Under <u>Kimbrough</u>, of course, this Court is well aware that this Court has the discretion to base a downward departure on the issue of the disparity between the crack and powder cocaine sentencing guidelines.

THE COURT: But they've been pretty clear about how much I should change that sentence with regard to the two-level difference, correct?

2.1

MR. ANDERSON: Well, the Sentencing Commission has said that they have started the process of fixing that anomaly within the guidelines and they frankly haven't yet addressed the issue of the career offender guideline range. So they started with that two-level, but they have made clear that that's the beginning of the process, not the end of the process, so I think that's important to consider. And I think it's also important to consider cases like <code>Kimbrough</code> and the other cases that I cited in my brief, that there are sentencing courts who are departing substantially downward based on that disparity and other issues within their case.

And in **Kimbrough**, Ms. Perzel correctly states that the court went down from 220-something to 15 years, but in that case that was the mandatory minimum. That was as low as the court could go because there was a ten-year mandatory minimum for the drugs and another five years for use of a firearm. In this case we don't have use of a firearm, so you are theoretically able to go down as far as to ten years, and we believe that that would be more than sufficiently -- more than a sufficient sentence under the facts of this case and certainly a sentence in the range of 262 and up would be greater than necessary under these facts.

The history and characteristics under 3553(a) of Mr. Tate, I would submit he was -- he was a long-term drug dealer, but I think a relatively low-level drug dealer. He

1 wasn't somebody who could be characterized as a kingpin. 2 was characterized as an average participant in this offense. And in addition, his prior convictions for those 3 4 two crimes of violence, the third degree assault and fourth 5 degree assault, I would submit that those are at least on the 6 lower range of the spectrum of the types of prior crimes of 7 violence that would get somebody in the situation where they 8 would be looking at a double departure, upward departure 9 based on the guidelines. So if you're using a base level 30, 10 if he didn't have the crime of violence, minus three points 11 for acceptance, it would have been 130 to 162 months. 12 Instead, the guidelines dictate 262 up to 327. 13 Although he has, you know, clearly an extensive 14 criminal record as revealed and shown clearly in the PSR, I 15 think it's significant he's never served any time in prison. 16 At most he's served eight months at a stretch for any 17 specific offense. 18 THE COURT: I have 18 months at one point. 19 MR. ANDERSON: He was sentenced to 18 months, but 20 he served initially one year, so serving eight months of that 2.1 one year. 22 THE COURT: All right. 23 I mean, just literally, he hasn't MR. ANDERSON: 24 sat in prison anywhere for 18 months or anything like that. 25 So a ten-year, 15-year sentence would be absolutely

2.1

significant and substantial for this person standing before you today, and meaningful, a meaningful sentence.

As you'll hear from him and as he has indicated to the probation officer, he takes responsibility for his action. He pleaded guilty. He's shown a desire to turn his life around. He recognizes he needs help. He needs treatment, counseling. He's looking forward to the educational opportunities he'll have. He's also I think significantly tried to assist in ways that have been related to the Court in camera, and he has continued to do that even to this week. It hasn't ultimately worked out in the fashion he had hoped, but it was — he has made — he has made his efforts and it's difficult from where he is.

As far as looking at what sentence would provide proper deterrence and protection of the public, again, ten years, 15 years would still be an incredibly strong deterrent and would protect the public.

Again, getting back to he's never served any actual prison time before, he's showing he's trying to turn things around, and I think the crack/powder cocaine disparity is another reason under this factor to show that giving somebody ten years or 15 years for this kind of offense even with his prior background and criminal record is sending a very strong message and keeping him off the streets for a significant, significant period of time.

2.1

And then finally, as I touched upon, the need to avoid unwarranted and unwanted sentencing disparities. There are numerous other courts — and I have to believe that it's going to be happening a lot more now that <code>Kimbrough</code> is out there. Courts are finding substantial reasons to grant substantial downward departures in these types of cases. And I think that looking at all the unique facts and circumstances of this case, as well as the facts and circumstances of this type of case in general, warrants a significant, substantial downward departure. We believe that ten years is sufficient, but certainly 15 years or less would be absolutely more than adequate under all of the factors that this Court should and can look at.

Finally, I don't know if this is appropriate, but two very quick requests from Mr. Tate are that he serve his time in Minnesota or as close to Minnesota as possible and that he would ask for credit for the time served since he was arrested on April 29th, 2007 and he's been in custody that entire time, so we would ask for credit for that time served.

THE COURT: Addressing your last point first, I guess, it was the thought of the probation officer and I think your client that he would benefit from the Residential Drug Abuse Program. He's not going to get the year off, but that would be at Sandstone or Waseca. Is that his preference?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

MR. ANDERSON: Yes. Yes. And in talking with him, I believe Waseca was his number one choice, but either one of those, and he has talked to me anyway about his wish to undergo that drug treatment program even though he may not get any specific credit for that. THE COURT: All right. Ms. Perzel, do you want to respond now before Mr. Tate? MS. PERZEL: Yes, your Honor, and I will do so just very briefly. In this case we need not look far to find a relatively analogous set of facts, because the defendant was involved with a number of co-defendants in this crime and we did have someone who was in some circumstances similarly situated, Mr. Chauvin, who was a career offender and who in that case received a sentence of I believe it was approximately 15 years. THE COURT: I have it in months, 180. MS. PERZEL: A hundred and eighty months. what I thought, your Honor. And as your Honor knows, there were some facts in that case that are different than what is being presented here and those were presented to the Court in camera.

With respect to the guidelines, the United States is asking that the Court sentence the defendant to the low end of the advisory range, which is 262 months. If the Court

considers -- chooses to consider the crack cocaine/powder cocaine disparity, although the United States believes

262 months is appropriate, the United States would request no greater than a two-level reduction -- that would be a 210- to 262-month range -- than at level 32.

The United States believes, your Honor, in this case that the sentence — that is the guideline range, the bottom of that box is appropriate in this case. We are seeing through our investigations a number of offenders who aren't selling significantly large quantities of drugs but are instead choosing to make a lot of money by parting out their drugs and selling the very small quantities. But based on this set of facts, your Honor, and the defendant's sadly very lengthy criminal history, the United States believes a guideline sentence is appropriate.

Thank you.

2.1

2.3

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Perzel.

Mr. Tate, you don't have to say anything, but if you want to tell me anything, I'd be happy to listen to you.

THE DEFENDANT: I'd just like to start this letter off by saying it's been so hard for me to think, let alone speak, what's been on my mind with the fear and anxiety that I'm having being in this situation, so I thought I'd put it on paper today.

First and foremost, I'd like to apologize to the

Court for any inconvenience that I may have caused.

2.1

Next I'd like to thank Mr. Anderson -- I'd like to thank Mr. Anderson for having an open ear and giving me understanding to the many questions that I've been needing to be answered. Thanks.

MR. ANDERSON: Thank you.

THE DEFENDANT: Now I'd like to speak on a personal matter, a matter that has to do with the position that I put myself in that has had a dramatic effect on my family and the communities that I sold drugs in.

First I want to speak on this issue about my mother, her having the breakdowns about never seeing me outside the prison walls again; secondly, my daughter, who suffers daily from my absence. Just a few months back I was told that she made comments about not wanting to live anymore. Her mother told me that she speaks dearly of me and her recent deceased grandmother. I'm not writing this to be — for you to be sorry for me, but to see that these two reasons alone is enough for a person to reevaluate his life.

I'd like to talk about a few more incidents that had happened that has affected me and the change in my life. It happened early last year, early 2007. It had to do with two guys from a neighborhood murder, one a very close friend of mine, another like a nephew.

At that time -- at those funerals and at that time,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

```
I seen the pain, a pain that I just -- that I was yet to see
in my life that affected a person's mother, a person's
father, and at that time I vowed to myself that I was going
to make a change, that I was -- I mean, it was the end of --
it was the end of this lengthy life that I lived that
involved selling drugs, selling crack.
          I remember -- I remember clear as day that last
night -- that last night that I was in Michigan, I was in
Detroit after that funeral, me and my mother sitting down,
and we talked, we laughed, we cried. And I went on
explaining -- I went on and told her how stressed I was, how
tired I was. I took her keys. I remember taking her keys
and returning to Minnesota. I was here two weeks, two weeks
before being picked up on other charges which led me here.
          Basically what I'd like to say -- I mean, I laid --
I made a bed that now I have to lay in. I'd just like to say
I'm sorry. I'm sorry. There's no more for me to say.
sorry.
          THE COURT:
                      Mr. Tate, you just turned 30, right?
          THE DEFENDANT:
                            Yes.
                      You've had a tough 30 years and you've
          THE COURT:
accumulated a lot of criminal history points, and as you can
see very dramatically what it does to the numbers in federal
```

I'm going to give you a sentence that's below the guidelines

court, it just puts you in these huge, lengthy sentences.

2.1

somewhat, but it's still a very, very long sentence and it has to be because of the serious behavior.

And we can argue -- and lots of what Mr. Anderson says I agree with -- about crack and cocaine and the treating of them differently and the attempts to try to treat them more alike, but that doesn't really answer all of the sentencing issues, because the other big driver in your sentence is 26 criminal history points. And as I said, I cranked that back a little bit on the advice of the Probation Office because of a couple factors, but there's no way to get around the fact you have a very bad criminal past.

So far, as you know, you sort of bounced along doing things on the installment plan, a few days here and there in the criminal system. As you can see now, it must feel to you and to me to a certain extent that the weight of the world has fallen on you because these huge numbers in federal court, particularly for offenses like this which are serious, mean very long sentences.

I have tried to look at where you stand in relation to your co-defendants in the case and what makes sense with regard to them, what makes sense with regard to the disparities between crack and cocaine, what makes sense with regard to the fact that even though you have a long criminal history, you've never served a particularly long sentence before, certainly nowhere near the sort of sentence that is

going to be required under the circumstances here.

2.1

Larry Curtis Tate, you have been charged in an indictment with conspiracy to distribute at least 50 grams of cocaine base and a detectable amount of cocaine in violation of Title 21, United States Code, Sections 841 and 846, which is a Class A felony, and based upon your plea of guilty it is considered and adjudged that you are guilty of the offense.

It is therefore adjudged that you be committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for imprisonment for a term of 211 months. You are to receive credit for the time already served.

It is also recommended that you participate in the 500-hour Residential Drug Abuse Program during the course of your incarceration.

It is also ordered that you serve a supervised release term of I believe it's five years under the following terms and conditions:

That you are not to commit any crimes; federal, state, or local.

You are to abide by the standard conditions of supervised release as recommended by the Sentencing Commission.

You are ordered not to possess any firearms or other dangerous weapons.

You are also ordered to cooperate in the collection

of your DNA as directed by the Probation Office.

2.1

I do order that you participate in a program for substance abuse as approved by the Probation Office, and that may may include testing, inpatient, outpatient treatment, counseling, or a support group.

It is also ordered that you contribute to the costs of such treatment as determined by the Probation Office

Copayment Program, not to exceed the total cost of treatment.

You are ordered not to associate with any member, prospect or associate member of the Detroit Boys gang or any other gang. If you are found to be in the company of such individuals while wearing the clothing, colors, or insignia of the Detroit Boys gang or any other gang, it will be presumed that the association was for the purpose of participating in gang activities.

You are also ordered to be employed at a regular lawful occupation deemed appropriate by the Probation Office. If not, you will be required to perform up to 20 hours of community service per week until fully employed.

You are ordered to participate in training, counseling, daily job search or other employment-related activities as directed by the Probation Office.

I am also going to add what's called a search condition to your supervised release. I don't do that very often, but I think in your case it's justified.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

You are ordered to submit your person, residence, office, vehicle or area under your control to a search conducted by the Probation Office or supervised release designee at a reasonable time and in a reasonable manner based upon a reasonable suspicion of contraband or evidence of a supervised release violation. You are ordered to warn any other residents or third parties that the premises and areas under your control may be subject to searches pursuant to that condition. It is also ordered that you pay the special assessment of \$100, which is due immediately. No fine will be imposed in light of your financial circumstances. Ms. Perzel, may Counts 2 and 3 now be dismissed? MS. PERZEL: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Tate, you have a right to appeal the sentence. You must do so within ten days. Actually, I quess it was waived at anything above two hundred and -- it says 262 months. Obviously the sentence is considerably below 262, so I don't think you have a right to appeal, but if you thought for some reason that right survived, you must file within ten days.

The Government does have a right to appeal this sentence, however.

And Mr. Tate is entitled to continued assistance of

counsel.

2.1

2.3

I have imposed a total sentence of 211 months and I do find that it complies with the statutory objectives for sentencing under Title 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a).

It is, as I indicated before, a sentence less than the recommended sentencing guidelines. I've done that for the reasons I've already discussed. It puts you in what the Court considers the appropriate proportionality of your sentence to other defendants. It also serves as just punishment, sufficient opportunity for rehabilitation, and it, as I said, does reflect some of the arguments raised by counsel which I've adopted in part.

I am going to recommend, Mr. Tate, as you requested, that you serve that sentence at Waseca because they have the drug program, but I don't want to mislead you. I can't control where your sentence is, so it's going to be just a recommendation. It's not a guarantee that you'll get there.

It is important, I think, that -- you have a supportive family and I think it's important that you be as close to them as possible under the circumstances, so I'll make that recommendation.

Anything further from the Government?

MS. PERZEL: No, your Honor. Thank you.

(612) 664-5108

THE COURT: Mr. Anderson? 1 2 MR. ANDERSON: Your Honor, does there need to be 3 anything specific regarding credit for time already served, 4 or did you say that? 5 THE COURT: I think I did say credit for time 6 already served, but they'll have that in the records. 7 Anything further? 8 (No response) 9 THE COURT: Good luck to you, Mr. Tate. 10 THE DEFENDANT: All right. God bless you. 11 (Proceedings concluded at 4:45 p.m.) 12 13 14 ERTIFICATE 15 I, TIMOTHY J. WILLETTE, Official Court Reporter 16 for the United States District Court, do hereby 17 certify that the foregoing pages are a true and 18 accurate transcription of my shorthand notes, 19 taken in the aforementioned matter, to the best 20 of my skill and ability. 2.1 22 /s/ Timothy J. Willette 23 TIMOTHY J. WILLETTE, RDR, CRR, CBC, CCP Official Court Reporter - U.S. District Court 24 1005 United States Courthouse 300 South Fourth Street 25 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55415-2247 612.664.5108